

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:
JOHN K. HARROP
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 400 SOUTH
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

R E C E I V E
AUG 27 2004
ANDREWS & KURTH L.L.P.

Applicant's or agent's file reference 12289.01		Date of Mailing (day/month/year) 13 AUG 2004 REPLY DUE within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing
International application No. PCT/US02/32756	International filing date (day/month/year) 16 October 2002 (16.10.2002)	Priority date (day/month/year) 16 October 2001 (16.10.2001)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): G06F 3/00 and US Cl.: 725/53		
Applicant DISCOVERY COMMUNICATIONS, INC.		

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 - I ☒ Basis of the opinion
 - II ☐ Priority
 - III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
 - V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - VI ☐ Certain documents cited
 - VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
 - VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 16 February 2004 (16.02.2004)

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer <i>Christopher Grant</i> Christopher Grant Telephone No. 703-305-4700
---	--

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet)(July 1998)

DOCKETED

OCT 13 2004

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:
JOHN K. HARROP
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 400 SOUTH
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 12289.01		Date of Mailing (day/month/year) 13 AUG 2004 REPLY DUE within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing
International application No. PCT/US02/32756	International filing date (day/month/year) 16 October 2002 (16.10.2002)	Priority date (day/month/year) 16 October 2001 (16.10.2001)
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC(7): G06F 3/00 and US Cl.: 725/53		
Applicant DISCOVERY COMMUNICATIONS, INC.		

1. This written opinion is the first (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.

2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- I ☒ Basis of the opinion
- II ☐ Priority
- III ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- IV ☐ Lack of unity of invention
- V ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2 (a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- VI ☐ Certain documents cited
- VII ☐ Certain defects in the international application
- VIII ☐ Certain observations on the international application

3. The applicant is hereby **invited to reply** to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. ~~The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension. See rule 66.2(d).~~

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4 bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.

4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: 16 February 2004 (16.02.2004)

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: IPEA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230	Authorized officer Christopher Grant Telephone No. 703-305-4700
---	---

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/US02/32756

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

- ☒ the international application as originally filed
- ☒ the description:
 pages 1-25, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the claims:
 pages 26-29, as originally filed
 pages NONE, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☒ the drawings:
 pages 1-9, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.
- ☐ the sequence listing part of the description:
 pages NONE, as originally filed
 pages NONE, filed with the demand
 pages NONE, filed with the letter of _____.

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

- ☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
- ☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
- ☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

- ☐ contained in the international application in printed form.
- ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.
- ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.
- ☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.
- ☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

- ☐ the description, pages NONE
- ☐ the claims, Nos. NONE
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/~~fig~~ NONE

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as "originally filed."

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US02/32756

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. STATEMENT

Novelty (N)	Claims <u>1-31</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO
Inventive Step (IS)	Claims <u>NONE</u>	YES
	Claims <u>1-31</u>	NO
Industrial Applicability (IA)	Claims <u>1-31</u>	YES
	Claims <u>NONE</u>	NO

2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS

Claims 1-31 lack an inventive step under PCT Article 33(3) as being obvious over U.S. Patent 5,835,087 to Herz in view of U.S. Patent 6,219,839 to Sampsell.

Regarding claims 1-31, U.S. Patent 5,835,087 to Herz discloses a system in which a user search profile is used by a news clipping service that retrieves articles from online news sources, the user's profile is utilized to compute how likely a user would be interested to read a given article, once calculations are preformed for each article, a list of identified articles is presented to the user, a user may then retrieve the generated list of articles and select an article they wish to view, the list is sorted according to how similar the article is to the user's search profile (column 57, line 45-column 5, line 56).

U.S. Patent 5,835,087 to Herz fails to disclose video and multimedia program content, and the scheduling or availability data for the content.

U.S. Patent 6,219,839 to Sampsell discloses an electronic resource guide in figure 7 which displays a schedule for a number of data services received over a cable modem and available on a PC 54, these streams may be video services, or the grid may have spaces for PC applications, a user may then select a service to be displayed on a monitor (column 4, lines 56-63, column 5, lines 40-63, column 6, lines 21-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to modify the profiling and retrieval system of Herz to include the multimedia downloads of Sampsell thus enabling a user to learn more about a news story or sporting event by viewing multimedia video.

----- NEW CITATIONS -----

US 6,219,839 B1 (SAMPSELL) 17 April 2001, see column 5, lines 40-65, column 6, lines 21-58, figure 6 and 7.

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/US02/32756

Supplemental Box

(To be used when the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient)

TIME LIMIT:

The time limit set for response to a Written Opinion may not be extended. 37 CFR 1.484(d). Any response received after the expiration of the time limit set in the Written Opinion will not be considered in preparing the International Preliminary Examination Report.